

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO).	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/994,521	09/994,521 11/26/2001		Scott Lochner	07326-002002	8530
20985	7590	02/08/2005		EXAMINER	
		SON, PC	SOBUTKA, PHILIP		
12390 EL CAMINO REAL SAN DIEGO, CA 92130-2081				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•			2684	
				DATE MAILED: 02/08/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/994,521	LOCHNER ET AL.				
Advisory Addion	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Philip J. Sobutka	2684				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
THE REPLY FILED 12 October 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) \square The period for reply expires $\underline{4}$ months from the mailing date of	the final rejection.					
b) L. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of	f the final rejection.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dath have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three more earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on 15 November 2004. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed amendment				
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ required place the application in condition for allow 6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ance because: See Continuation	Sheet.				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w		•				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-9,17,21</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
10. Other:						
NICK CORSARO NICK CORSARO						
PRIMARY EXAMINER						
Mut Con						

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not convincing. Applicant argues that Auer does not teach continuously displayed screen, but Auer is the primary reference providing the claimed environment. It is Tymes that has been added to teach the feature of burst techniques with computer displays. Note that Tymes clearly teaches the remote terminals with displays (Tymes col 5, lines 1-5) coupled via burst (packet) protocol (Tymes col 2, line 55 - col 3, line 18) Clearly Tymes does not intend that the displays only present data for the few millisecond of the burst. It should also be noted that the instant inventions does not claim transmitting moving picture video, rather is it in the realm of computer display. As is well known, computer displays are essentially static, so much so in fact that most computers must be equipped with screen savers to prevent the static image from burning into the display.

Regarding claim 17, note that in the proposed combination the burst would supply all of the information for the display, so of course if anything in the display were changed, the burst would have supplied the data. Note that the claim does not state that the burst ONLY contains the CHANGED data

Regarding claim 9, in the event of an appeal, a reference will be cited to replace the Official Notice.

Philip J. Sobutka 703-305-4825 (or 571-272-7887)

NICK CORSARO
PRIMARY EXAMINER